

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MAUREEN PIEKANSKI,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 3:20-CV-00687
)	
ALEX M. AZAR, II,)	(Hon. Martin C. Carlson, U.S.M.J.)
)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

NOTICE

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, Plaintiff Maureen Piekanski’s Motion for Summary Judgment together with a brief in support thereof and all accompanying papers (Dkt. No. 28, “Motion”) was filed in this matter on June 12, 2020. Pursuant to Middle District of Pennsylvania LR 7.6, Defendant Alex M. Azar, II’s “brief in opposition [to the Motion] and LR 56.1 responsive statement, together with any transcripts, affidavits or other relevant documentation” was required to be filed within twenty-one (21) days of the Motion.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that, by Order of Court, entered July 2, 2020 (Dkt. No. 30), Defendant was granted an enlargement of time to file a “Memorandum in Support of its Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment,” until July 13, 2020.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that, on July 10, 2020, Defendant filed a Motion to Stay Proceedings (Dkt. No. 32), and that as of the date of filing this Notice, said Motion to Stay Proceedings remains pending before the Court. Defendant has made no effort to obtain a ruling on its Motion to Stay Proceedings, but instead has engaged in the self-help remedy of assuming its requested relief has been granted.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that, as of the date of filing of this Notice, Defendant has not filed any opposition to the Motion¹ or obtained a stay of these proceedings, and therefore, Plaintiff contends that, pursuant to Middle District of Pennsylvania LR 7.6, Defendant “shall be deemed not to oppose such [M]otion.”

Dated: August 7, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark W. Fidanza

Mark W. Fidanza, Esq.

REED SMITH LLP

Three Logan Square

1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7301

Telephone: 215-851-8100

Facsimile: 215-851-1420

mfidanza@reedsmith.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Maureen
Piekanski*

¹ Nor has Defendant filed a “Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment,” which it previously indicated to the Court that it would be filing. (*See* Dkt. No. 29.)